

Lead Entity Advisory Group

June 29, 2005

Seatac, WA

Summary Notes

LEAG Attendance:	<p>Doug Osterman, WIRA 9 Jean White, WRIA 8 Jeanette Dorner, Nisqually Tribe Jeff Breckel, Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board Richard Brocksmith, Hood Canal Coordinating Council Martha Neuman, Snohomish County Kristi Lynett, WDFW Sara LaBorde, WDFW Tim Smith, WDFW John Sims, Quinault Nation Frank Sweet, City of Selah Richard Brocksmith, Hood Canal Coordinating Council Rollie Geppert, IAC/SRFB Neil Aaland, IAC/SRFB Lee Napier, Grays Harbor County Alan Chapman, Lummi Tribe Steve Martin, Snake River Salmon Recovery Board</p>
WDFW Report	<p>The Governor has directed all state agencies to reduce their mid-management (WMS- Washington Management System) positions by 1000 FTEs. This translates to 15-20 for WDFW. While our agency has only just begun to discuss our potential response, Brian Walsh's position is currently classified as WMS. Lead Entity support positions will be re-evaluated and filled upon Marnie Tyler's return in July.</p> <p>The Lead Entity budget for 2005-2007 has not yet been signed. SB5610 was signed in Kirkland on May 13.</p> <p>The Legislature committed \$20 million in capitol dollars for salmon recovery efforts. This is an increase from \$12 million in the last budget. The federal budget is not yet finalized (final in October, but funds not available until spring of 2006), but at this point, it looks like WA should receive generally the same amount of funding as last year (maybe a small decline). For planning purposes LEs should anticipate the same amount of funds as available last year for projects.</p>
Monitoring Forum Update	<p>Richard Brocksmith presented an overview of the April Monitoring Workshop results (see handouts). The workshop's main goal was to improve the State of the Salmon Report (12 salmon indicator dials). Although it was a great 2 days of discussion, the goal of improving monitoring data in order to better communicate to a national audience is not really the focus of Lead Entities, or other watershed partners. Many people felt that if substantially more funds are to be committed to monitoring they should be used for informing management decisions. The Forum consensus was that the monitoring priority at a high level scale should be number of adults and number of smolts. Six topical subcommittees were formed in order to develop more detailed recommendations back to the Forum at their next meeting in July. It will be very important for the Lead Entity Program to fill a</p>

	<p>monitoring niche. The monitoring dollars are receiving increased scrutiny and determining what monitoring will be accomplished and how will be an important topic this year.</p>
WSDOT-RFEG Prioritization Proposal	<p>Barb Aberle, Alternative Mitigation Coordinator for WSDOT came to address LEAG questions and concerns about the RFEG contract with the Legislatively created TPEAC (Transportation Permit Efficiency and Accountability Committee). TPEAC's charter is to find creative, innovative solutions to improve permit and mitigation opportunities. To this end, TPEAC is interested in using established locally driven processes, based in science, to help guide mitigation alternatives. The RFEGs contract is a pilot project to demonstrate to the committee one option salmon projects may be identified. TPEAC still intends to use all available resources (including Lead Entities) to help them find and select mitigation projects.</p> <p>Several Lead Entities mentioned their surprise at seeing the RFEG's draft prioritization matrix (see handout). They did not know of its development and feel that their Lead Entity committees already identify and prioritize salmon recovery projects potentially suitable for WSDOT. A suggestion was made that WSDOT staff engage more directly with Lead Entity committees in watershed with upcoming transportation projects.</p>
SRFB 6th Round	<p>Neil Aaland gave an update on the new Veteran's Conservation Corps law that state the SRFB should give preference to projects that use post-traumatic stress disorder veterans. IAC staff have just begun discussion with the VA, so implementation this round may be in a pilot project. IAC staff will be presenting more information on this topic once it is developed.</p> <p>Neil and Rollie presented a handout on options for 6th round funding allocations. They are looking to have criteria established well before the funding meeting in January. SRFB staff have not yet formalized any of their own ideas regarding an allocation scenario and are looking for input from Lead Entities. The only major sideboard as laid out by the SRFB itself is that the non-competitive portion may not be greater than 35% of the total amount available. IAC staff will presenting ideas and options to the SRFB at their next meeting on June 9 & 10.</p>
Lead Entity Program Review	<p>WDFW discussed the genesis of the program review (see handout). After hearing generally from the LEs present, WDFW acknowledged that the immediate need is to rectify the budget shortfall for 2005-2007. Re-evaluating lead entities and the statewide funding would occur at a later date. WDFW proposed to reduce LE administrative support to help alleviate the deficit. LEs stated they would like to see WDFW's contract deliverables with IAC and our historic task budget breakdown as well as our proposed budget by activity. LEs also generally expressed their desire to receive full funding this next fiscal year and to work on finding additional funding or efficiencies for the second year. Phil Trask will make revisions to the Program Review document based on comments expressed at the LEAG meeting and send a second draft out for all LE review.</p>
NEXT MEETING	Seatac, Not Yet Scheduled